



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE
SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA 94066-5006

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090

Ser 1841.2/7050

27 Nov 1996

From: Commanding Officer, Engineering Field Activity (EFA), West, Naval Facilities
Engineering Command

To: Distribution

Subj.: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) DECEMBER 12, 1996 MEETING

Encls: (1) December 12, 1996, RAB Agenda

(2) Draft RAB Meeting Minutes of November 14, 1996

1. There will be a meeting of the RAB on Thursday, December 12, 1996 at the Ambrose Community Center, 3105 Willow Pass Road, Bay Point, CA.
2. Enclosure (1) is the draft agenda for the December 12, 1996, RAB meeting, which will begin at 7:00 p.m. This meeting will focus on the RAB's comments and responses to the Draft RI Report for the Inland Area Sites and an update on the Litigation Area Sites.
3. Enclosure (2) is the draft RAB meeting minutes of the November 14, 1996, RAB meeting. This document will be finalized during the RAB meeting scheduled for December 12, 1996.
4. If you have any questions or comments regarding the issues discussed in this letter, please contact me at (415) 244-2558, or Mr. John Rosengard, RAB Community Co-chair, at (510) 601-8740.

Ronald Yee
RONALD YEE
By direction

Distribution:

Ms. Elizabeth Robinson Anello
Mr. Steven Bachofer
Ms. Shirley Buford
Mr. Jim Campbell
Mr. Scott Etzel
Mr. Craig Fletcher
Mr. John Fuery
Mr. Steve Gallo
Mr. Edward Gardner
Ms. Susan Gladstone
Mr. Neal Grindheim
Mr. James Koeppel

5090
Ser 1841.2/7050
27 Nov 1996

Subj.: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB) DECEMBER 12, 1996 MEETING

Mr. David Kory
Ms. Sylvia Kotecki
Mr. Eugene Kuroczko
Mr. Ralph Lambert
Mr. Clint Mayfield
Ms. Loulena Miles
Ms. Colleen Monahan
Mr. Larry Myers
Mr. Raymond O'Brien
Ms. Connie Peak
Mr. Richard Pieper
Mr. James Pinasco
Mr. Richard Purdue
Mr. David Rege
Ms. Tatiana Roodkowsky
Mr. John Rosengard
Ms. Catie Roy
Mr. Herb Schwartz
Mr. Thomas Shirley
Dr. Barbara Smith

Copy to:
Mr. George Delacruz
Mr. Ronald Yee

DRAFT AGENDA
NAVAL WEAPONS STATION CONCORD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

Thursday, December 12, 1996

7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.
Ambrose Community Center
3105 Willow Pass Road
Bay Point, California

7:00 - 7:05	Welcome and Introductions
7:05 - 7:15	Community Co-chair's Report
7:15 - 7:20	Approval of Meeting Minutes
7:20 - 7:30	Update on the Litigation Area - Anju Vig
7:30 - 8:00	Discussion of Draft Letter on the Inland Area Remedial Investigation Report - Scott Etzel
8:00 - 8:10	Break
8:10 - 8:45	Discussion of Draft Letter on the Inland Area Remedial Investigation Report (Continued) - Scott Etzel
8:45 - 8:50	Future Agenda Topics and Action Item Update
8:50 - 9:00	Public Comment
9:00	Adjournment

**NAVAL WEAPONS STATION CONCORD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

**Ambrose Community Center
3105 Willow Pass Road
Bay Point, California**

Thursday, November 14, 1996

I. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS/COMMUNITY CO-CHAIR REPORT

A. Welcome and Introductions

The Naval Weapons Station (NWS) Concord Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) met at 7:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 14, 1996, at the Ambrose Community Center in Bay Point, California. Mr. John Rosengard, the community co-chair, opened the meeting and reviewed the evening's agenda. He stated that the primary agenda item was a presentation on the Inland Area Remedial Investigation (RI) Report and open discussion of the RI report.

B. Community Co-Chair Report

1. Site tour of the Inland Area

Mr. Rosengard reported that on Saturday, November 2nd, the Navy conducted a site tour of the naval weapons station's Inland Area. The purpose of the site tour was to familiarize interested RAB members with this area prior to discussing the RI report. At the site tour, RAB members and guests were taken on a walk through the Inland Area sites. Mr. Rosengard indicated that copies of handouts distributed during the site tour are available. Ms. Anju Vig of PRC Environmental Management, Inc. (PRC), stated that the site tour handouts were included in handouts to be passed out during the Inland Area RI presentation.

2. Public Relations Committee

Mr. Rosengard noted that the Public Relations Committee is considering producing a videotape for publicity purposes to be distributed to local news and cable stations. He explained that the review of other committee reports would be postponed to a future meeting in order to devote more time to the RI presentation.

3. Administrative Items

Mr. Rosengard asked RAB members to review the meeting minutes from the last RAB meeting and made a motion to approve them as distributed. Mr. Ed Gardner indicated that he had not received a copy of the minutes. Mr. Rich Purdue confirmed that Mr. Gardner's mailing address was correctly reflected on the RAB mailing list.

II. INLAND AREA REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION REPORT

Ms. Vig and Mr. Jim Polek of Montgomery Watson presented an overview of the draft Inland Area RI Report. The purpose of this report is to present the results and findings of the environmental investigation conducted at the Inland Area sites. Ms. Vig and Mr. Polek distributed a handout summarizing their presentation. Copies are available to RAB members.

1. Historical Land Use and Environmental Overview of the Inland Area

Ms. Vig began her presentation by discussing the historical background of the facility. The Installation Restoration (IR) Program at NWS Concord was established in 1981; the base was subsequently added to the Superfund National Priorities List (NPL) in 1994.

Ms. Vig provided a brief overview of previous environmental investigations conducted at NWS Concord since 1983. She reviewed the five sites investigated under the Inland Area RI:

- 1) Site 13, known as the Burn Area
- 2) Site 17, where Building IA-24 and Solid Waste Management Unit (SWMU) 12/20 are located
- 3) Site 22, where Building 7SH5 and SWMU 52 are located
- 4) Site 24A, known as the Pistol Firing Range, and
- 5) Site 27, where Building IA-20 is located.

The RI included developing objectives, performing field work, evaluating data, and recommending action. The report is divided into nine main sections: (1) Introduction, (2) Setting, (3) Investigation Methods, (4) Applicable or Relevant and Appropriate Requirements (ARAR), (5) Site-Specific Results, (6) Human Health Risk Assessment, (7) Ecological Risk Assessment, (8) Fate and Transport, and (9) Recommendations and Conclusions.

Ms. Vig explained the risk assessments in more detail and then turned the presentation over to Mr. Polek to review the site-specific recommendations.

2. Site-Specific Recommendations

Mr. Polek reviewed the site-specific results of the RI site by site. He detailed the proposed course of action for addressing soil and groundwater contaminants site by site. The site-specific recommendations are contained in the handouts provided to everyone in attendance at the meeting. Additional copies of the handouts are available.

3. RAB Discussion

Following the presentation, Ms. Vig and Mr. Polek opened the floor for questions and general discussion. Mr. Scott Etzel asked whether any endangered species inhabit the Inland Area. Dr. Greg Linder, a PRC ecological risk assessor, responded that there are no threatened or endangered species at Site 13 or in Seal Creek (Site 17). Ms. Connie Peak inquired what time of year the assessments were conducted and stated that the creek does not flow during the summer. Ms. Vig replied that the assessments were conducted between May and June, and that the creek was flowing at that time. Mr. Rich Purdue asked what processes or substances are associated with phthalate. Mr. Polek explained that the chemical is associated with plastic

and packaging materials. Dr. Linder stated that phthalate is contained in Armor All™, for example. Ms. Peak asked if the trichloroethene (TCE) found at Site 22 is originating off-site. Mr. Polek responded that the source has not been identified at this time but will be confirmed in the course of further investigation.

Mr. Scott Etzel asked for a brief summary of findings from the unexploded ordnance (UXO) investigation activities. Mr. Polek stated that flare casings and bullets were discovered at Site 13 during the gully and trench testing; a day-to-day log of findings is contained in the appendices of the RI Report. Mr. Etzel asked why the California Quail was selected as a species of concern at the Inland Area. Dr. Linder responded that ecological risk assessment is still a relatively young science when compared with human health risk assessment. The California Quail is representative of the data that is available from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Ms. Peak noted that there is a difference in the ecological risk assessment for tidal communities and inland species. She asked if the work plan accounts for these differences. Ms. Susan Gladstone of the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) explained that sediment chemistry and Microtox tests were used to evaluate receptor communities at the Tidal Area Sites, while a more classical approach was applied to the Inland Area sites. Dr. Linder added that EPA has developed more data for freshwater and sediments than for inland areas. Ms. Peak asked if both areas were treated equally. Ms. Gladstone responded that more is known about wetlands than upland areas and there is typically more biodiversity in wetlands. In addition, ecological risk assessments must be adapted to the data that is available.

A RAB member interested in the fate and transport of contaminants at Site 27 asked whether the DDE and alpha and gamma chlordane is migrating. Mr. Polek stated that the contaminants are being transported by erosion into a nearby drainage ditch; however, only the top 6 inches of soil are being affected.

Mr. Steve Bachofer stated that he had read that pesticides are sometimes better left undisturbed in soil; he noted that the current scientific trend is to leave slightly contaminated soils in situ. Mr. Polek responded that the affected soil at Site 27 could easily be removed. Mr. Bachofer asked if the amount of pesticides present at the site would drop below conservative preliminary remediation goals (PRG). Mr. Polek stated that the amount of pesticide present at the site is probably close to an acceptable risk range. Mr. Etzel asked how much soil the Navy is planning to remove. The response was 400 cubic yards.

Ms. Tatiana Roodkowsky asked if there is a regulatory reason for moving the soil or keeping it in place. Dr. Linder responded that the trend is towards leaving soils in place. Soil cleanups are generally not as extensive as water cleanups. Ms. Gladstone stated that the decision to remove the soil or leave it in place will be driven by the risk assessment. Mr. Richard Pieper, the Navy co-chair, added that proceeding to a removal may be the most cost-effective approach. Mr. Bachofer stated that the potential for exposure by personnel on the station is much less than potential exposure levels for a residential scenario. Mr. Pieper stated that exposure is negligible; fencing and signs might be an alternative to removing the soil. Mr. Pieper also stated that, from an operational standpoint and considering the potential risk, the Navy would prefer to remove the soil if abandonment of the site cannot be justified definitively. Ms. Gladstone affirmed that if the soil is left in place, the potential for erosion will remain.

Mr. Rosengard asked how much it cost to complete the RI report. Mr. Ronald Yee responded that it has cost approximately \$250,000 to write the report. To date, for PRC and Montgomery Watson to write the sampling plans and conduct the field work, the total cost including field sampling and the report has been about \$1.2 million. Mr. Rosengard also asked if the Inland Area can be described as clean. Mr. Yee stated that the area will meet the State of California's requirements once the recommended actions have been carried out. Mr. Rosengard then asked if NWS Concord is the "best" NPL site. Ms. Gladstone replied that NWS Concord is listed as an NPL site, but stated that the Inland Area is not the portion of the base that caused NWS Concord to be added to the NPL.

Mr. Purdue asked if NWS Concord would be cleaned up if it were private property rather than federal property. Mr. James Pinasco of the California Department of Toxic Substances Control replied that federal facilities are not viewed differently from their private sector counterparts for the purposes of environmental restoration. Ms. Gladstone added that, in general, her initial reviews of the document have not yet indicated any major problems. She stated that she may have differing opinions about some of the proposed cleanup methods. Mr. Pieper stated that the waterfront portions of the installation were prioritized and that sites were ranked internally as to relative risk (that is, high, medium, and low risk sites). He added that if the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry indicated that human health risks were posed by the site, those areas posing a risk would be prioritized for cleanup.

Ms. Peak asked if Ms. Gladstone was concerned about erosion and runoff or a lack of surface water samples in the RI investigation. Ms. Gladstone responded that when the work plans were written, she had discussed the issue with the Navy; all parties agreed at that time that if there was ponded water, surface water samples would be taken. Mr. Pieper added that a storm water pollution prevention plan has been provided to the RWQCB and that the issue is under consideration. He also stated that if there had been any likely sources for surface water contamination, sampling would have been conducted. Ms. Gladstone said that surface water is an issue at Site 22 because there is a lot of drainage. Mr. Roy Glenn of PRC affirmed that surface water samples were taken at SWMU 12/20 near Site 22.

Mr. John Bosche of PRC announced that when the Qualitative Ecological Risk Assessment for the Litigation Area is completed, in early December, three copies would be provided to the RAB, since many of these figures were color and the cost of reproduction would be high. Mr. Rosengard stated that three copies would be adequate.

III. Other Business

A. RAB Operating Procedures

1. Proposed Changes to RAB Membership Procedures

Mr. Etzel described his proposed revisions to the RAB membership procedures. Mr. Etzel explained that he attempted to develop a "humane" policy designed to accommodate RAB members who are interested in participating in the RAB but cannot attend all the meetings. The proposed procedures also include a method for removing inactive RAB members. He stated that he had initially drafted the procedures based on the assumptions that the RAB would be shifting to quarterly meetings. As a guideline, RAB members must attend 25 percent of all meetings in order to maintain an active status. After discussing the proposed

procedures, the RAB agreed to accept them once the procedures were revised to address monthly RAB meetings. RAB members also agreed that the Procedures Committee will be the implementing committee for the new membership procedures. Mr. Rosengard stated that he would contact Mr. Larry Myers, as chair of the Procedures Committee, to advise him of the revised procedures and his role in monitoring their implementation.

2. RAB Comments on the Inland Area RI Report

Mr. Rosengard called for a volunteer to compile RAB comments on the Inland Area RI Report. Mr. Etzel volunteered to compile the comments and write a cover letter to transmit the comments to the Navy. RAB members will fax their comments on the RI Report to Mr. Etzel. A meeting will be held to discuss and synthesize the comments and to provide input to Mr. Etzel regarding the contents of the cover letter. The date of the meeting was to be announced at a future time.

3. Topics for the Next RAB Meeting

Mr. Rosengard proposed the following topics for the December RAB meeting:

- Draft letter on the Inland Area RI Report
- Partial deletion of NWS Concord from the NPL (with possible guest speakers from EPA)
- Zoning Real Estate Appraisal of the Concord Area
- Progress on the Litigation Area

Ms. Roodkowsky reminded the RAB that at a previous meeting, the RAB agreed to invite a representative from Congressman Miller's office to provide a presentation. Dr. Eugenia McNaughton of EPA stated that Dr. Dan Stralka from EPA will be attending the January RAB meeting to provide a presentation on risk assessment. Dr. McNaughton also announced that she was planning to attend a conference hosted by the Society for Environmental Toxicology and Chemistry (SETAC). She offered to report back to the RAB about the conference. In addition, Dr. McNaughton announced that Ms. Nicole Moutoux has been named as a permanent EPA representative and that she will be attending the December RAB meeting. Dr. Linder stated that information about SETAC is available on the World Wide Web. The web page address is www.setac.org.

The next RAB meeting will be held on Thursday, December 12, 1996.

IV. ACTION ITEMS

A. Status of Action Items from October RAB Meeting

1. Ms. Roodkowsky will invite a representative from Congressman Miller's office and Congressman Baker's office to a future RAB meeting to present the political ramifications of partial delisting of NWS Concord from the NPL.
2. Mr. Rosengard will invite an EPA representative to a future RAB meeting to provide information regarding partial delisting of NWS Concord from the NPL.

3. Mr. Myers will provide Ms. Suzanne Craft with minutes from the most recent Procedures Committee meeting for inclusion as an attachment to the September RAB meeting minutes.
4. The public relations committee will evaluate its functions, redefine its mission and goals if necessary, and report its findings to the RAB.
5. Ms. Roodkowsky will format and provide an updated list of RAB members.

B. Action Items Identified at November RAB Meeting

1. Mr. Rosengard will notify Mr. Myers of the revisions to the membership procedures and his role, as chair of the Procedures Committee, in implementing them.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Rosengard adjourned the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

VI. ATTACHMENT

- A. Sign-in sheet from the November 14, 1996, RAB meeting

ATTACHMENT A
SIGN-IN SHEET FOR NOVEMBER 14, 1996, RAB MEETING

Naval Weapons Station Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
November 14, 1996

RAB Members Please Sign In:

Name	Address	Telephone/E-Mail
Rich Pieper	WPNSTA Concord	(510) 246-5650
Susan Gladstone	RWQA	510-286-0840
John [unclear]	OTSC	916 255 3719
Angus Vig	PRC	415 222-8224
Eugene McNaughton	EDA	415 744-1636
John Rosengard	Piedmont Cr	510 628 7740
Scott Etzel	Concord	827-9576
Linda Zukerman	WPNSTA Concord	346-5591
EDWARD GARDNER	128 NORMAN AVE. Clyde, Ca 94500-1105	510-696-1837
CONNIE REAK	CONCORD	671-2598
COLLEEN MONAHAN	CONCORD	685-2610
Jim SHIRLEY	RESC 114 CONCORD 94522	671-7693
Jeffrey Kotick	3648 Grantz Rd Concord	686-1964
Patricia Roodman	500 Verona St #311 OAKLAND	510 654-6680
Ronald Yea	900 Commerce Dr. San Bruno	(415) 244-2518
Steve [unclear]	20 Valley Ct. Pleasant Hill	(510) 944-1453
Rich Purdie	30 Kirkwood Court Concord	(510) 925-0547

Naval Weapons Station Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
November 14, 1996

Guests Please Sign In:

Name	Address	Telephone/E-Mail
DR. MARIE MIGLIORE	247 A STREET CONCORD CA	510-246-5817
John Bosche	PRC	415 222 8295
JIM POLEK	MONTGOMERY WATSON	510-975-3491
Becky Dorw	P.O. Box 27491, Concord 94527	510-930-8757
Greg Under		
Ange Vig		
ROY GIBSON	Hill	Phone
Kathy Walsh	PRC 135 Main St Suite 1800 SF CA 94105	415.222.8254

